

REMARKS

An excess claim fee payment letter is submitted herewith for one (1) additional claim.

Claims 1-35 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 17-18, 21, and 26-27 are amended to more clearly define the invention and claim 35 is added. Claims 1, 17, and 26 are independent.

These amendments are made only to more particularly point out the invention for the Examiner and not for narrowing the scope of the claims or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Support for new claim 35 is found in the specification at, for example, page 28, lines 14-16.

Applicants also note that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicants' intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Gunn et al. reference. Claims 3-4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gunn et al. reference in view of the Do reference. Claims 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Gunn et al. reference in view of the Cirne reference.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention, as defined by, for example, independent claim 1 is directed to a display control device that includes a display control section adapted to display a plurality of button groups each having at least one button in a monitor connected thereto and to display any of the buttons displayed in the monitor in focused state, and a button change section including an in-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from one button to another within the button group, and an inter-group button changing operation unit adapted to change the button to be focused from a button of one button group to a button of another button group. When the button to be focused is changed by the inter-group button changing operation unit from the button of one button group to the button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

Conventional display control devices do not coordinate the display of objects or images in a manner which is easily and quickly comprehended.

The present invention provides a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. In this manner, the operation of the display may be easily and quickly comprehended.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTION

The Examiner alleges that claims 2-4 are indefinite. While Applicants submit that such would be clear to one of ordinary skill in the art to allow them to know the metes and bounds of the invention, taking the present Application as a whole, to speed prosecution claims 2-4 have been amended in accordance with Examiner Bonshock's very helpful suggestions.

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

III. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. The Gunn et al. reference rejection

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-16, the Examiner alleges that the Gunn et al. reference teaches the claimed invention. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by the Gunn et al. reference.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. As explained above, this feature is important for quickly and easily comprehending operation of the display.

The Gunn et al. reference discloses a data entry display for a personal computing device. In particular, the Gunn et al. reference discloses a digital keyboard 28 which groups

buttons according to frequency of use. The more central the position of a group of buttons, then the more frequently the buttons in that group have been used.

The Gunn et al. reference clearly does not teach or suggest a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

Indeed, the Gunn et al. reference does not appear to teach or suggest changing a focused state of any button at all, let alone displaying a predetermined button in a focused state when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group.

With respect to new claim 35, the Examiner appears to equate the relative positioning of groups within frequency related circles as disclosed by the Gunn et al. reference with the claimed change of focus. However, contrary to this allegation, the Gunn et al. reference does not teach or suggest a focusing state that comprises a cursor positioned at the button.

Clearly, this aspect of the present invention as recited by claim 35 is not anticipated by the Gunn et al. reference.

Therefore, the Gunn et al. reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 1-2, 6-7, 11-12, and 14-16.

B. The Gunn et al. reference in view of the Do reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 3-4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34, the Examiner alleges that the Do reference would have been combined with the Gunn et al. reference to form the claimed invention. Applicants submit, however, that these references would not have been combined and, even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. This feature is important for quickly and easily

comprehending operation of the display.

As explained above, the Gunn et al. reference does not teach or suggest these features.

The Do reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Gunn et al. reference.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that the Do reference remedies these deficiencies.

Rather, the Do reference merely discloses a user interface for operating a plurality of bundled applications on a central computer.

Clearly, the Do reference does not teach or suggest a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state.

Moreover, Applicants submit that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the references are directed to completely different matters and problems.

Specifically, the Gunn et al. reference is concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device. ([0008]).

In stark contrast, the Do reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of providing an interface for a full function computer for use as a home theater, entertainment, education, information, and home banking personal computer. (col. 1, lines 39 -44).

One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device, as the Gunn et al. reference is concerned, would not have referred to the Do reference and vice-versa, because the Do reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of providing an interface for a full function computer for use as a home theater, entertainment, education, information, and home banking personal computer. Thus, the references would not have been combined.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 3-4, 13, 17, 21-26, and 30-34.

C. The Gunn et al. reference in view of the Cirne reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 5 and 8, the Examiner alleges that the Cirne reference would have been combined with the Gunn et al. reference to form the claimed invention. Applicants submit, however, that these references would not have been combined and, even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. This feature is important for quickly and easily comprehending operation of the display.

As explained above, the Gunn et al. reference does not teach or suggest these features.

The Cirne reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Gunn et al. reference.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that the Cirne reference remedies these deficiencies.

Rather, the Cirne reference merely discloses a system for creating a focus ordering between items in a dialog box. The Cirne reference explains that a focus ordering determines the order of navigation between items. (Col. 2, lines 52 - 65). In other words, a focus ordering determines the order that each individual item will be navigated in relation to the other items. For example, the Cirne reference explains that a focus ordering determines that that "A4 Letter" 22b will be focused following "US Letter" 22a (Figure 1A). In other words, the Cirne reference discloses a method and system that determines the order of navigation between items.

The Cirne reference does not teach or suggest saving any focus item at all, let alone changing back to the saved focus item in response to an inter-group button change as claimed. Further, the Office Action does not point out with particularity where the Examiner alleges that these claimed features may be found in the applied references as required by M.P.E.P. section 707.05.

Moreover, Applicants submit that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the references are directed to completely different matters

and problems.

Specifically, the Gunn et al. reference is concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device. ([0008]).

In stark contrast, the Cirne reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of automatically generating an intuitive, logical focus ordering in a dialog. (Col. 4, lines 43-46).

One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device, as the Gunn et al. reference is concerned, would not have referred to the Cirne reference and vice-versa, because the Cirne reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of automatically generating an intuitive, logical focus ordering in a dialog. Thus, the references would not have been combined.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 5 and 8.

D. The Gunn et al. reference in view of the Do reference and further in view of the Cirne reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 9-10, 18-20, and 27-29, the Examiner alleges that the Do reference would have been combined with the Gunn et al. reference and further alleges that the Cirne reference would have been combined with the Do reference and the Gunn et al. reference to form the claimed invention. Applicants submit, however, that these references would not have been combined and, even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

As explained above, none of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including a display control device which, when a button to be focused is changed by an inter-group button changing operation unit from a button of one button group to a button of another button group, the display control section displays a predetermined button of the button group changed in focused state. This feature is important for quickly and easily comprehending operation of the display.

Moreover, Applicants submit that these references would not have been combined as

alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the references are directed to completely different matters and problems.

Specifically, the Gunn et al. reference is concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device. ([0008]).

In stark contrast, the Do reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of providing an interface for a full function computer for use as a home theater, entertainment, education, information, and home banking personal computer. (col. 1, lines 39 -44).

In stark contrast to the Do reference and the Gunn et al. reference, the Cirne reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of automatically generating an intuitive, logical focus ordering in a dialog. (Col. 4, lines 43-46).

One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with providing a system for computer-assisted text generation and entry using a pointing device with a personal computing device, as the Gunn et al. reference is concerned, or who was concerned with the problem of providing an interface for a full function computer for use as a home theater, entertainment, education, information, and home banking personal computer, as the Do reference is concerned, would not have referred to the Cirne reference and vice-versa, because the Cirne reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of automatically generating an intuitive, logical focus ordering in a dialog. Thus, the references would not have been combined.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 9-10, 18-20, and 27-29.

IV. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-35, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed

10/606,333

20


DOCKET NO. C14-159454M/TRK

below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 5/31/17



James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715

McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254